



HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY NEWSLETTER

II: 2

summer 1975

PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS: IV

IF THERE IS A RED LINE ACROSS THE END OF YOUR
MAILING LABEL, THIS IS THE LAST ISSUE YOU WILL
RECEIVE UNTIL WE RECEIVE PAYMENT FOR YOUR
SUBSCRIPTION

With this, the fourth number of HAN, and the completion of volume two, one might assume that our venture was safely off the ground. In fact, however, our future is unsure. From the point of view of content, the physical dispersion of the members of the editorial board has somewhat inhibited the decentralized collective responsibility that was our original goal--although non-Chicago members have made important editorial contributions. At the same time, we have received or successfully solicited contributions from a number of people not on the editorial board, and we look forward to more in the future. Certainly, the general activity these days in the history of anthropology, and the specific response to HAN, seem to justify optimism.

Content alone, however, will not guarantee the future of HAN. Nor will the considerable unpaid efforts of the small number of people who actually handle the production (Regna Darnell and Linguistic Research, Inc., along with the Chicago members). We must have money enough to handle the costs of supplies and postage, as well as occasional costs of hired labor when our volunteers are struck by illness, as happened with the last issue. At the present moment, we have enough money to pay for the outstanding costs of that last issue, and for the present one, with a small amount left over towards the next. But if volume three is to be assured, a considerable portion of the people who have not yet sent in money for their subscriptions will have to respond.

At the present time, a precise count reveals that we have a total of 126 paid subscribers (25 of which are libraries). Although this is about twice the number reported in our last issue, there are still 141 people who are carried on our lists as subscribers (and who have received copies of HAN) who have not yet sent in checks. In many cases, we are sure that this is merely oversight, since among them are in fact people who sent research reports and even one or two regular editorial contributors. But if we are to guarantee volume three, we must take

some step to prod negligent subscribers. To this end, we have adopted the policy indicated above, which will apply both now and in the future:

IF AT ANY TIME THERE IS A RED LINE ACROSS THE END OF YOUR MAILING LABEL, THAT WILL BE THE LAST ISSUE THAT WILL BE SENT TO YOU UNTIL WE RECEIVE PAYMENT FOR YOUR SUBSCRIPTION (OR RENEWAL).

As indicated in our last number, rates for a one year subscription (or for two numbers) are as follows:

Individual subscribers (U.S. and Canada)	\$2.00
Student subscribers (U.S. and Canada)	1.00
Institutional subscribers	3.00
All non-U.S. or Canadian subscribers	3.00

Checks should be made out to History of Anthropology Newsletter, in U.S. dollars, and sent to our Secretary-Treasurer, Robert Bieder, at the Newberry Library, 60 W. Walton St., Chicago, Illinois, 60610, U.S.A.

Correspondence relating to editorial matters should be directed to George Stocking, Department of Anthropology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, 60637, U.S.A.

The Editorial Committee

George Stocking (Editorial Secretary) University of Chicago	Robert Bieder (Secretary-Treasurer) Newberry Library
Robert Berkhofer University of Michigan	Regna Darnell University of Alberta
Dell Hymes University of Pennsylvania	Judith Modell University of Minnesota
Timothy Thoresen University of California, Berkeley	

SOURCES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

ARCHIVES ON THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Charles Leslie
New York University

Working on a biography of Robert Redfield for the Columbia University Press series, "Leaders of Modern Anthropology," I have been impressed by the excellent organization, accessibility, variety and richness of the documents in the Department of Special Collections of the University of Chicago Library. With the cooperation of the anthropology department, the library is further improving the collection. Albert M. Tannler, of the Department of Special Collections, should be consulted for further information.

Robert Redfield's papers are the richest single body of material in the collection. They have been sorted in folders and filed in 88 archive boxes. Ruth Solie, who has Master's degrees in both anthropology and library science, worked for a full year on the collection, writing a 91 page Guide that provides a sophisticated summary of Redfield's career and of the subjects covered by the papers as they relate to his career.

The Redfield papers document his association with institutions from the AAA and the Carnegie Institution of Washington to the United World Federalists and Wenner-Gren Foundation. His correspondence with colleagues records the whole range of professional and intellectual issues they raised with him between the early 1930s and 1958. Margaret Redfield has also deposited personal family letters which are particularly interesting because he wrote them while engaged in field research, or while away from home to attend conferences and committee meetings. They often describe in a witty manner the details of these activities, and they reveal intimate aspects of Redfield's character.

Field notes, diaries, maps and other research materials from Tepoztlan, Yucatan and Guatemala are filed by topic and chronological order. The historian can trace Redfield's collaboration with Alfonso Villa-Rojas, Sol Tax and numerous other associates. His methods of working are fully documented by research proposals, summary reports for funding agencies, manuscripts and publications. The historian can study in detail the transformation of projects as research progressed from field work to published articles and books.

Milton Singer has added 17 boxes of papers on the project which he and Redfield directed together, the Comparative Study of Cultures, funded by the Ford Foundation. Thus, 105 archive boxes are devoted to Redfield's work. This project lasted from 1951 to 1958, and the correspondence, reports and manuscripts reveal how Singer and Redfield collaborated with many specialists in Islamic, Chinese and Indian civilizations (and some students of Latin America, or scholars like Harry Hoijer). Their work

encouraged social scientists and scholars in the humanities to see and use the possibilities of complementary research.

The Redfield papers include more than I have been able to study or use for the small biography I am working on -- for example, many boxes of teaching materials and student papers. For historians with other interests they could be studied in relation to other materials relating to the history of anthropology at Chicago, beginning with the papers of Frederick A. Starr (1859-1933), the first anthropologist at the University. Starr arrived when the University opened in 1892 and retired in 1923. His diaries, notebooks and scrap books document travels and interests in Mexico, Africa, Europe and the Orient. The Newberry Library also owned papers on Starr, and has transferred its holdings recently to the Department of Special Collections at the University. Starr failed to establish significant research or a graduate program at Chicago during his tenure, but he was a popular undergraduate teacher, sought newspaper publicity, and was decorated by various governments. Starr's papers provide material to study the much neglected field of kitsch anthropology during a most interesting period, 1892-1920.

When Fay-Cooper Cole (1881-1961) took a job at the University in 1924, replacing Starr, he expected to initiate a strong graduate program and to separate anthropology from sociology (where it had been tentatively housed from 1892). Cole hired Edward Sapir the following year, and Robert Redfield in 1927, and in 1931, Radcliffe-Brown. Cole established a genial, mutually supportive atmosphere within the department, and good working relationships with the sociologists. This, too, gave Chicago a distinctive climate for the development of anthropological scholarship. The separate department was formed in 1929, and the 34 boxes of departmental papers in the library archives cover the period from 1929 to the early 1950s. Described in a 21 page Guide, they contain Cole's correspondence as department chairman (1929-46), documents on archaeological projects, general correspondence, and copies of undergraduate and graduate examinations. Student papers on graduate examinations for several years immediately after W. W. II are also included in this collection, which is uneven and official in tone, but hopefully will be fleshed out with additional documents still in departmental files.

Finally, Sol Tax has promised the library his papers and has begun turning them over. All of the correspondence, memos, reports and manuscripts of the Darwin Centennial celebration are available in 11 boxes (this was a good example of Tax's originality and skill in arranging large scholarly meetings). Also, the records of Current Anthropology, starting with the process by which Tax initiated the journal and carrying through the whole period of his editorship, are available for study in 142 boxes: 40 boxes contain documents of conferences, meeting notes and correspondence about the journal, and the rest are Associate reply letters. These materials, and the rest of Tax's papers when they become available, will provide unique opportunities for historians to study the professionalization processes that transformed anthropology after the Second World War, in which Tax played a central role.

FOOTNOTES FOR THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

CRANIA AND CONSCIENTIOUSNESS: THE RELATIONS OF PHRENOLOGY AND ETHNOLOGY IN BRITAIN AND AMERICA, c. 1840.

The following letters were written by George Combe, the Scottish phrenologist, to Samuel G. Morton, the Philadelphia physician and progenitor of the polygenetic "American School of Physical Anthropology" which was to achieve world-wide recognition in the 1850's. Combe had lectured in the United States in 1838, had examined Morton's collection of crania, and had offered to draw up some interpretive remarks for the Crania Americana which Morton published in 1839. Although Morton had signed a testimonial to Combe after hearing his course of lectures, and accepted "the fundamental principles of Phrenology", he was quite cautious in applying these to the interpretation of his crania, preferring to "present the facts unbiassed by theory." He printed Combe's essay, but as an appendix, rather than as an introduction. At this point Morton had not yet committed himself to polygenism, nor had the physical anthropological impulse clearly differentiated itself from the ethnological. Given Morton's obvious sensitivity to popular intellectual opinion, it is hardly surprising that he should have dedicated his English edition to Prichard, who was at this time clearly the leading ethnologist in Britain. Prichard's ethnology, although essentially monogenetic and diffusionist, presented itself as a "physical history of man", and was by no means unconcerned with the sort of data that Morton collected. Despite Combe's fears, Prichard's review of Morton's work in volume 10 of the Journal of the Royal Geographical Society was commendatory, and made no reference to phrenology. The letters are reprinted with the permission of the American Philosophical Society. For additional background, consult William Stanton, The Leopard's Spots (Chicago, 1960), and George Stocking, "From Chronology to Ethnology: James Cowles Prichard and British Anthropology, 1800-1850", introduction to Prichard, Researches into the Physical History of Man (Chicago, 1973).

1/13/1840

I am not gratified by learning that your English Edition is dedicated to Dr. Prichard. He has an excellent Intellect, and a well balanced head, with one exception, a deficient organ of Conscientiousness. I speak from observing his development. In regard to Phrenology, he has shown a lamentable defect of honest & fair dealing. A man of this kind is one who is a capital friend as long as it is his interest or inclination to be a friend; but no perfect reliance can be placed on his conduct where interest or inclination (vanity, for example, or ambition) dictate one course of action & duty another. He is much esteemed at Bristol, where he resides; and I hope no jealousy (sic) or other motive will render him unworthy of your regard. At the last meeting of the British

Association, Dr. Prichard asked money to procure specimens to enable him to illustrate the natural history of man. W. Hewett Watson asked him if he had examined the collection of national crania in the museum of the Phren. Socy. of Edin. when he was in that city. He answered No! W. Watson told him that he should use the materials within his reach before he asked for money to purchase more. Our collection is said to be the largest in Europe.

1/31/1840

W. Hewett Watson intended to purchase three copies of your work at his own expense & present them to public Institutions but when he read the dedication to Dr. Prichard, he abandoned his purpose! Dr. Caldwell, also, I find, regards Prichard as most disingenuous even on his own subject. Dr. P. I hope will not visit on you, now that he sees your Phrenological leanings, any of the transgressions which he thinks we have committed. He is, I believe, a Unitarian, & is the more inexcusable as he has not the excuse of bigotry for his hostility to the new philosophy.

CLIO'S FANCY--DOCUMENTS TO PIQUE THE HISTORICAL IMAGINATION

THE CLOSING OF THE FRONTIER IN AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGY?

Curtis M. Hinsley, Jr.
Colgate University

The last decade of the nineteenth century was a strange period of transition and uncertainty in American anthropology. Not yet established in American universities, dominated by the aging figures of Brinton, Putnam and Powell, without a truly national journal of communication, the young science could not even promise livelihoods to students with an interest in the science of man, as the uncertain career of Franz Boas himself illustrated in the mid-1890s. To be sure, Washington, D. C., provided both an institutional nexus--through the Bureau of American Ethnology, the U. S. National Museum and the Anthropological Society of Washington--and a theoretical coherence of sorts in the unilinear evolutionism of Powell and his followers. But Powell's was a dying tradition. By the turn of the century, when the rugged outdoor life, exercise and the "Wild West" were being celebrated in American art and literature, the boundless, open frontier of Powell's generation of explorer/surveyors had already become a thing of the past.

The closing of the frontier--and the frontier mentality--in anthropology involved turning from the vigorous and indiscriminate data-collecting and loose generalizing that had characterized earlier American anthropology (and natural science generally) to concerns about

methodology and subjectivity; from an informal system of education by personal example and field experience to structured university accreditation (although the personal model, as with Boas, still remained prominent). For some the changes did not come easily. Powell had meant to "organize" anthropology in America, not professionalize it; he died in 1902, just at the onset of university anthropology. Some younger men, however, caught in the changing patterns, felt the new standards and criteria more acutely.

Young Harlan I. Smith, son of a Saginaw, Michigan, real estate developer, spent all his spare time as a student at the University of Michigan visiting nearby Ojibwa villages, and he dreamed of a career in anthropology. In the early 1890s he followed closely the debate between William Henry Holmes in Washington and Frederic Ward Putnam at Harvard over the antiquity of man in North America. At the World's Fair in Chicago in 1893 he met Boas, and three years later followed him to New York. After a year or so of tutoring with Boas in linguistics, Smith joined the Jesup Expedition for three years, eventually returning to the American Museum of Natural History. In 1895, however, Smith's future was cloudy, and he expressed the doubts that others must have shared to Washington anthropologist Frank Hamilton Cushing, a self-made scientist of the older generation:

...Will this work for which I have given my time and study now for a number of years earn for me from now on a living and at the same time afford a chance for study and improvement? Will the subject of anthropology require so many men as are fitting for it? Will it offer them a living? Can I fit myself well enough to hold a place or is the number of men having better facilities and early advantages so great that I will be crowded under and have to turn to another occupation? I often fear that my culture and intilectual (sic) capacity will not stand comparison with eastern men that are coming on. While I feel that my ability for manual labor, technology, frontier work, hard study, and scientific accuracy will compare with any field worker or museum assistant I ever knew personally. (sic) There is very little about camp life and frontier work whether in the woods or on inland waters which I have not tried. And it is the same with museum laboratory work, photography, cast making etc. My training in methods of biologic work with the microscope and knife has given me an idea of careful methods and the value of true seeing which I hope will prevent me from making such mistakes as some of my friends, workers in museum & field, have made by carelessness or hasty concluding. On the other hand I feel very weak in booklearning. I know how to learn better than many but know less of the results of learning than most. Now I fear I have gone too far and been too free with private matters, however I feel sure you will not allow my confidence to go where it will do harm. Will you not advise me of the outlook for such an one as I, as well as suggest how I may soon get a situation where the bread and butter side of life may be assured. . . .

(letter in W. J. McGee Papers, Library of Congress)

BIBLIOGRAPHICA ARCANIA

I. RECENT GERMAN LITERATURE ON THE HISTORY OF ETHNOLOGY (PART ONE)

James Ryding
Freie Universität, Berlin

This bibliography covers scholarship published in the last five years and research currently in progress in the Federal Republic of Germany. It is based on responses to a questionnaire sent to the 13 university institutes for ethnology and on articles in major journals. The entries are ordered chronologically according to the period and topics dealt with. The list is not exhaustive; I will include literature on the history of ethnological linguistics, institutions such as museums and associations, and literature in the remaining German-speaking countries in a following issue of the Newsletter.

General Surveys:

Karl Jettmar. "Die anthropologische Aussage der Ethnologie", in H.-G. Gadamer and Paul Vogler, eds., Kulturanthropologie, pp. 63-87, (Stuttgart: Thieme, 1973); discusses the historical relationship between ethnology and neighboring disciplines such as history, philosophical anthropology and ethnology; also the significance of the concept of the equality/inequality of humanity in ethnology.

Brigitte Klein, Free University Berlin, is doing research for a Ph.D. Diss. that will analyze the manner in which non-European religious movements have been interpreted and classified in modern European ethnology.

Lawrence Krader, The Asiatic Mode of Production. (Assen: Van Gorcum, fall 1975); deals with the European reception and criticism of the Asiatic mode since the 17th century.

Klaus E. Müller. Geschichte der antiken Ethnographie und ethnologischen Theoriebildung. Von den Anfängen bis auf die byzantinischen Historiographen. Vol. 1, (Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1972); ethnography and ethnological theories in Ancient Near Eastern (Babylonian, Egyptian, Isreali, Phoenician) literature and of 45 Greek writers are outlined and discussed. A second volume (1977) will trace these topics through the Roman, early Christian and medieval eras including the Byzantine historians.

Michael Oppitz. Notwendige Beziehungen. Abriss der strukturalen Anthropologie. (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1975); contains broad coverage of the history of modern ethnology from the perspective of present-day structuralism; deals primarily with the history of mythology, concepts of structure and Levi-Strauss' structural analysis and his critics. Oppitz is doing research for a book that will examine the category 'exotic' in ethnographic scholarship, popular ethnology and modern travel literature. He also plans articles on the literary nature of ethnographic writings, Georg Forster's descriptive style and the nature of Marcel Mauss' influence.

Justin Stagl. Kulturanthropologie und Gesellschaft. (München: List, 1974); pp. 11-64 outline the specialization of anthropological and sociological disciplines in Germany since the late 19th century.

Enlightenment:

Brigitta Benzing is completing a book (Mainz, Habilitation Diss., late 1975) on the influence of 18th-century French political theory on modern ethnology.

Urs Bitterli. "Der Eingeborene im Weltbild der Aufklärungszeit", Archiv für Kulturgeschichte. 53(1971):249-263; surveys theological and philosophical views on the status of primitive peoples during the Enlightenment.

Hans Fischer. "'Völkerkunde', 'Ethnographie', 'Ethnologie'", Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. 95(1970):169-182; traces the lexical histories of the terms; provides lengthy quotes from early usages around 1800.

Wolf Lepenies. Soziologische Anthropologie. (München: Hanser, 1971); pp. 77-114 deal with social criticism in the ethnological writings of Rousseau and Diderot, De Bonald's critique of Condorcet and Forster's critique of Kant over the issue of monogenism. "Eine vergessene Tradition der deutschen Anthropologie: Wissenschaft vom Menschen und Politik bei Georg Forster", Saeculum. 24(1973):50-78; Forster's ideas for a science of man are discussed within the context of his political ideas.

Joachim Moebus, Free University Berlin, is doing research for a book that will study the attempts to establish a unified science of man in France and Germany around 1800.

Nineteenth Century:

Doris Binder. "Deutsche Algerienreisende des 19. Jahrhunderts", Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch. 20(1970):212-215; lists several German travellers and their travel accounts of Algeria from 1850 to 1890.

Annamarie Fiedermutz-Laun. Der Kulturhistorische Gedanke bei Adolf Bastian. (Wiesbaden:Steiner, 1970); this intellectual biography deals with Bastian's major ethnological theories; the author argues that throughout his prolific ethnological writings the geographic-historical approach took precedence over a socio-scientific psychology. "Aus der Wissenschaftsgeschichte: Adolf Bastian und die Deszendenztheorie", Paideuma. 16(1970):1-26; summarizes the polemical debate between Bastian and Haeckel over evolutionary and social evolutionary theories.

Friedrich Kochwasser. "Heinrich von Maltzan's Algerien-Reisen um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts", Zeitschrift für Kulturaustausch. 20(1970):216-222; H. von Maltzan's travels in Algeria and his ethnographic reports are dealt with briefly.

Lawrence Krader. The Ethnological Notebooks of Karl Marx. (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1972); contains the manuscript excerpts and notes that Marx took from his readings of Lubbock, Maine, Morgan and Phear. Krader discusses the significance of the notebooks, the transition in Marx's writings from a philosophical anthropology to an empirical ethnology and the subsequent reception of his ethnology in the following: Ethnologie und Anthropologie bei Marx. (München: Hanser, 1973); "Karl Marx as Ethnologist", Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences. 35(1973):304-313; "The Works of Marx and Engels in Ethnology Compared", International Review of Social History. 18(1973):223-275.

Fritz Kramer, Free University Berlin, is completing a book dealing with the philologist and archaeologist G. F. Creuzer and his influence on Bachofen, Nietzsche and Flaubert.

Joan Leopold. "Britische Anwendungen der arischen Rassen-theorie auf Indien 1850-1870", Saeculum. 25(1974):386-411; deals with the reception of Max Müller's theory of the Arian race among various scholars in Britain and its implications for colonial policy in India.

Cyril Levitt. Anthropology and Historical Jurisprudence: An Examination of the Major Issues in Marx's Excerpts from H. S. Maine's 'Lectures on the Early History of Institutions'. (Berlin, Ph.D. Diss., 1975); situates the ethnological notebooks of Marx within the context of his other major anthropological writings and examines Marx's treatment of Maine's theories of kinship, law and the state.

Gerhard Lutz. "Volkskunde, 'Lehre vom Volke' und Ethnologie", Hessische Blätter für Volkskunde. 62/63(1971-2):11-29; "Johann Ernst Fabri und die Anfänge der Volksforschung im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert", Zeitschrift für Volkskunde. 69(1973):19-42; these two articles examine the origins of folklore studies and the terms Volkskunde, Völkerkunde, Ethnographie and Ethnologie within the context of late 18th-century and early 19th-century geography and political science; emphasis on Fabri, F. J. Schmitthenner and W. H. Riehl.

Henning Ritter, Free University Berlin, is completing a Ph.D. Diss. on the ethnological theories of Marcel Mauss. He recently translated and edited (with Wolf Lepenies) a two-volume collection of essays by Mauss including an introduction by Levi-Strauss: M. Mauss, Soziologie und Anthropologie. (München:Hanser, 1974-75).

James Ryding. The Emergence of Ethnology as an Academic Discipline in Germany. (Berlin, Ph.D. Diss., 1976); will trace the treatment of ethnological topics within the university system from the late 18th century until the founding of the discipline around 1870; emphasis on the universal historians of the Göttingen School and the historical geographers in Berlin. "Alternatives in 19th-Century German Ethnology", Sociologus, 1975; discusses some theoretical models in the sociology of science and their application to the development of German ethnology. "Kulturgeschichtsschreibung zwischen 1840 and 1860", (with Heinrich Dilly), Ms. 1975; outlines and classifies the numerous cultural histories of the mid-19th century including an attempt by a group of historians to organize the study of German cultural ethnohistory.

Twentieth Century:

Jürgen Hildebrandt. Die Rezeption des Relativismus in der deutschen Ethnologie. (Mainz, M. A. Diss., 1975); an article dealing with the reception of cultural relativism in German ethnology will appear in the Zeitschrift für Ethnologie. Hildebrandt has begun research for a Ph. D. Diss. on the history of the concept of the family in ethnology and sociology. He has also written an introduction to a new German edition of Morgan's Ancient Society to appear late in 1975.

J. W. Raum. Die Lehren der Neo-Evolutionisten Leslie White, Julian Steward und ihrer Schüler in ethnologischer Sicht. (München, Habilitation Diss., 1973); Raum plans to publish this study of the Neo-Evolutionist school of thought in the near future.

II. SOME PUBLICATIONS OF THE LAST DECADE ON THE HISTORY OF MUSEUM ANTHROPOLOGY

William Sturtevant
Smithsonian Institution

Abel, Herbert.

1969 Beiträge zur Geschichte des Übersee-Museums. Veröffentlichungen aus dem Übersee-Museum in Bremen, Reihe B, Bd. 2, pp. 53-72, 75-104. (Two parts, 1808-91, 1892-1949)

Bell, Whitfield J., Jr. et al

1967 A cabinet of curiosities: five episodes in the evolution of American museums. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.

Birket-Smith, Kaj

1968 Fra Kunstskammeret til Ny Vestergade; Traek af Etnografisk Samlings historie. Pp. 27-54 in his Strejftog--arktiske, tropiske og midt imellem. (Copenhagen:) Nationalmuseet. (History of the Ethnographical Collections of the Danish National Museum.)

Blackwood, Beatrice

1970 The origin and development of the Pitt Rivers Museum. Pp. 7-16 in B. Blackwood's The classification of artefacts in the Pitt Rivers Museum Oxford. Pitt Rivers Museum, University of Oxford, Occasional Papers on Technology 11.

Collier, Donald

- 1972 Men and their work. Field Museum of Natural History Bulletin 43(8):7-9. (Brief history of the Field Museum anthropology dept.)

Condliffe, J. B.

- 1971 Te Rangi Hiroa: the life of Sir Peter Buck. Christchurch, N.Z.: Whitcombe & Tombs. (Re Bishop Museum; see also the review article by K. Luomala in Journal of the Polynesian Society 83(4):467-78, 1974)

Darnell, Regna

- 1970 The emergence of academic anthropology at the University of Pennsylvania. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences 6(1):80-92.

Dexter, R. W.

- 1966 Frederic Ward Putnam and the development of museums of natural history and anthropology in the United States. Curator 9:151-155.

Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia

- 1967 El Museo de las Culturas, 1865-1866, 1965-1966. México: Instituto Nacional de Antropología e Historia.

Jeanneret, Alain

- 1969 Aperçu historique du Musée d'Ethnographie de Bâle. Études Asiatiques 23(1-2):58-68.

Kaeppler, Adrienne L.

- 1970 Feather cloaks, ship captains and lords. Bernice P. Bishop Museum Occasional Papers 24(6).
- 1974 Cook voyage provenance of the 'artificial curiosities' of Bullock's Museum. Man n.s. 9:68-92.

McKern, W. C.

- 1965 The Barrett era. Lore 15(4):114-119. Milwaukee Public Museum.

McKusick, Marshall

- 1970 The Davenport conspiracy. (Office of the State Archaeologist of Iowa Report No. 1. (A late 19th c. "archaeological conspiracy."))

Miller, Edward

- 1974 That noble cabinet: a history of the British Museum. London: Deutsch.

Rivière, Georges Henri

- 1969 My experience at the Musée d'Ethnologie. Proceedings of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland for 1968, pp. 17-21.

Stanukovich, T. V.

- 1974 Muzei antropologii i etnografii v sisteme akademii nauk. Sovetskaiā Etnografiā 2/1974:3-11 (English abstract, "The anthropological & ethnographical museum of the USSR Academy of Sciences," p.40).

Straaten, H. S. van der

- 1969 Van testament tot 'volkenkunde.' Verre Naasten Naderbij 3(1): 14-31. Leiden. (Brief history of the Rijksmuseum voor Volkenkunde, Leiden, emphasizing origins and earliest history.)

Strong, D. E.

- 1973 Roman museums. Pp. 247-264 in Archaeological Theory and Practice, ed. by D. E. Strong. London and New York: Seminar Press. (On collections of art & other objects in ancient Roman public and religious buildings.)

Sturtevant, William C.

- 1969 Does anthropology need museums? Pp. 619-49 in Papers Presented at a Symposium on Natural History Collections, Past, Present, Future, ed. by Daniel M. Cohen and Roger F. Cressey, Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington, vol. 82, pp. 559-762.

Trennert, Robert A., Jr.

- 1974 A grand failure: the Centennial Indian Exhibition of 1876 Prologue 6 (2):118-129.

III. RECENT WORK BY SUBSCRIBERS

Ackerman, Robert, "Frazer on Myth and Ritual", Journal of the History of Ideas 36 (1975), 115-134.

Bock, Kenneth, "Comparison of Histories: The Contribution of Henry Maine," Comparative Studies in Society and History 16 (1974), 232-262.

Hymes, Dell, "Lexicostatistics and Glottochronology in the 19th Century (with Notes toward a General History)", pp. 122-176 in I. Dyen, ed., Lexicostatistics in Genetic Linguistics (The Hague: Mouton, 1973).

Leaf, Murray J., "The Development of Modern Anthropology", in Frontiers of Anthropology, Leaf et al (New York: Van Nostrand, 1974).

Malefijt, Annemarie de Waal, Images of Man: A History of Anthropological Thought (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1974).

Nelson, Benjamin, "Max Weber on Race and Society", Social Research 38 (1971), 30-41.

Parssinen, Terry, "Popular Science and Society: The Phrenology Movement in Early Victorian Britain," Journal of Social History (Fall, 1974)

- Popkin, Richard, "The Philosophical Basis of Eighteenth-Century Racism", pp. 245-262 in H. E. Pagliaro, ed., Racism in the Eighteenth Century (Cleveland: Western Reserve, 1973).
- Rowe, John H., "The Spelling of Arch(a)eology", Anthropology Newsletter 16 (#6, 1975), 11-12.
- Speth, William, "Friedrich Ratzel and the Shaping of American Anthropology," Proceedings, Association of American Geographers (in press).
- Voget, Fred W., A History of Ethnology (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975).
- Weber, Gay, "Science and Society in Nineteenth Century Anthropology," History of Science 12(1974), 260-283.

RESEARCH IN PROGRESS

I. THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF SOCIAL SCIENCE: OFFICIAL ANTHROPOLOGY IN THE BRITISH EMPIRE

Henrika Kuklick
University of Pennsylvania

The social scientist castigating himself for the unconscionable application of his research has become a frequent spectacle nowadays, and the anthropologist has been perhaps the most enthusiastic self-flagellant (cf. Talal Asad, ed., Anthropology and the Colonial Encounter; Dell Hymes, ed., Reinventing Anthropology; and in general, the columns of the New York Review of Books). My own project is designed to question the received opinions about the relationship of anthropology and British colonialism during the inter-war period. This involves separating two questions which are usually treated as one: the effect of Colonial Office influence on the development of academic anthropology; and the use of anthropological research by colonial governments. This separation is impossible unless one avoids the mistake common to much intellectual history: the tendency to ignore the actual content of ideas under study, and to presume that the proximity of bodies implies intellectual exchange between them.

Many have argued that the coincidence of the dominance of functionalism in anthropology and Indirect Rule in administration is more than accidental. Malinowski indeed endorsed Indirect Rule and undertook an intensive campaign to convince colonial officials of the relevance of his work to theirs. The International African Institute, which embodied Malinowski's position, did in fact assume an important advisory role for the Colonial Office. By no later than 1929, the permanent staff of the Colonial Office consulted Malinowski in outlining a training program for future colonial civil servants which stressed "the value and efficiency of customs and ideas rather than their history." Malinowski in fact made the C. O. an ally in his battle for academic power; it repudiated the sort of work he deplored--historical evolutionary research.

But despite the fact that imperialist spokesmen like Lord Lugard and Lord Hailey identified functionalist anthropology as more useful than any other, it was not necessarily used by administrators. Indeed, the social anthropology written by administrative officers who contributed to Africa and by those who were appointed by colonial governments to do anthropological research (men like Talbot, Meek, Rattray, and Cardinall) was virtually everything but functionalist. It represents rather a condensed history of a century of British anthropology. During the inter-war period colonial anthropologists were still arguing whether the races of the world were in fact separate species or a single one, and evolutionism, which had subsequently supplanted the old debate between monogenists and polygenists, was still a working model. Insofar as colonial anthropologists were affected by contemporary academic anthropology, it was more by diffusionism than by functionalism. Colonial research only appears to be functionalist occasionally because functionalism intersects with evolutionism at several points---such as the notion of growing institutional differentiation. Intellectually, the colonial anthropologists were far from consistent: their analyses mixed polygenist, evolutionist, and diffusionist approaches haphazardly, even though these models conflicted with each other.

My relatively full information about Ghana does not conflict with the hypothesis that Malinowski's alliance with the Colonial Office had no significant consequences for the colonies. Administrators there assumed that the growth of large, centralized tribal states was both the inevitable and desirable result of European culture contact, and Rattray endorsed historically-oriented research to uncover candidates for tribal consolidation. The political service took his practical anthropology seriously, and required all new Assistant District Commissioners to write original anthropological essays. Superior officers periodically assigned their subordinates anthropological research projects. But although the Colonial Office directed the Gold Coast to adopt functionalism in 1929, it did not do so. The restoration of the Ashanti Confederacy in 1935 realized Rattray's hopes, and political officers continued to research and effect tribal mergers, even though they found that the resulting lines of authority were fragile. Not until the end of interwar period did it occur to many administrators that they were dramatically altering traditions.

I propose to develop my research further in two ways. First, using the British archives, I would like to determine the degree to which the Colonial Office was the eminence grise behind British anthropology. I expect to demonstrate that government support was influential in British academia, but that this connection did not lead to the use of academic research in colonial administration. Instead, colonial requirements fostered the creation of an eclectic anthropology. Secondly, I would like to do a detailed archival case-study of the country I know best (Ghana), and by systemically reading District Commissioners' reports, to determine how anthropology actually was applied in the field.

II. THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTHROPOLOGICAL THEORY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO AND COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, 1931-1937

Robert McMillan
York University, Toronto

This dissertation deals with the academic institutionalization of anthropology during the Depression years at Chicago and Columbia. I have attempted to examine what Dr. Leslie White has called the "social organization of ethnological theory" in order to explain the quality and quantity of research and theory produced by graduate students of these two institutions. Specific emphasis is given to those students who studied with Radcliffe-Brown and Robert Redfield in the years 1931 to 1937 and those who worked under Franz Boas and Ruth F. Benedict during approximately the same period. In addition to the academic context, other factors and personalities that influenced the development of student work will be investigated. Foremost among these are: funding foundations, general economic conditions, professional organizations, museums, and such persons as Edward Sapir, Ralph Linton, Margaret Mead, Abram Kardiner, Melville Herskovits, and others.

I have asked if the academic context alone can explain the emergence of anthropological theory. Also I have investigated the ideological presuppositions underlying theory. This latter investigation is undertaken so that "1930's" anthropological theory might be related to concurrent ideas in other areas of American thought and literature. Among other things, I have tried to understand: (1) The nature of an intellectual community in terms of the ways in which people work, live and think together i.e., the problems, suffering and happiness of persons involved in a common endeavor, (2) The psychology of persons involved in pioneering activities, (3) The purposes and meanings attached to the notion "anthropology" by technically qualified persons, and (4) The psychological and sociological implications of particular anthropological methods of categorizing human phenomena.

Ultimately my investigation suggests that Dr. White's model is not really adequate historically. There was no Boasian school of thought at Columbia nor was there a Radcliffe-Brown manner of thinking in Chicago work. Nevertheless the model is useful as a reference point in explaining this fact. Given the particular historical situations of Chicago and Columbia during the 1930's, schools might have formed. My study explains why the aforementioned model does not fit the facts.

My conclusions are based upon several kinds of evidence: examination of the Ruth Benedict Papers, the papers of Franz Boas, documents from the Central Files at Columbia, and various collections of papers at the University of Chicago's Regenstein Archives. As well I have studied published secondary accounts, published anthropological writings, and other kinds of published materials. Also I have corresponded with and interviewed many alumni from the period.

III. RESEARCH NOTES

Regna Darnell, Department of Anthropology, University of Alberta, is working on the professionalization of Canadian anthropology, with special emphasis on the Natural Museum of Canada under Sapir, Jenness and Barbeau, in relation to both the Boasian and the British anthropological traditions, using both archival and oral historical sources.

Don D. Fowler, Desert Research Institute, University of Nevada, is doing a History of field manual anthropology from before 1800 up to about 1910, based on both manuscript and published materials, with an attempt to assess the data gathered by specific manuals. (cf. HAN I:1)

Murray Leaf, Department of Anthropology, UCLA, is completing a study of two intertwined themes in the history of anthropology (conceptions of primitive mentality, and of the relation of science and social science) largely on the basis of published materials, and with emphasis on the philosophical orientations underlying the work of anthropological writers.

Donald MacRae, Professor of Sociology at the London School of Economics, is continuing research (which has produced articles at regular intervals since 1951) into the general history of anthropology from Lafitau forward, with emphasis on learned societies and journals, social anthropology not in English, and Southern and West African anthropology.

William Speth, Associate Professor of Geography, University of Arkansas, has completed a manuscript on "The Anthropogeographic Theories of Franz Boas."

Leslie E. Sponsel, doctoral candidate at Cornell, currently doing fieldwork in the Amazon, has done research on the history of primatology and the academic development of physical anthropology, especially at Harvard, and with Dr. Henry T. Epp is publishing an article on the history of anthropology in Canada, from 1860 to 1940.

Charles F. Urbanowicz, California State University, Chico, is doing research on the development of anthropological theory for the Pacific Islands, based on manuscript sources in the Mitchell Library, Sydney and the Turnbull Library, Wellington.

Robin W. Winks, Professor of History, Yale University, is working on the impact of the writings of George Henry Fox-Lane Pitt-Rivers and Lucien Levy-Bruhl on British colonial officers and missionaries in the field.

(see also the listings of research in Germany in the article by James Ryding elsewhere in this issued)

IV. DISSERTATIONS IN PROGRESS

Frederic E. Hoxie, American Civilization, Brandeis, is doing a doctoral dissertation on United States Indian policy in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, including the role of anthropologists in its formation.

(see also the listing of research in Germany elsewhere in this issue.)

GLEANINGS FROM ACADEMIC GATHERINGS

Although the vast majority of papers were devoted to the history of psychology (and to a lesser extent, sociology), the seventh annual meeting of CHEIRON: The International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, held at Carleton University, in Ottawa, Canada, June 5-8, 1975, included for the first time a significant anthropological input. There was a session devoted to "Essays on the History of Anthropology in the Past Century", with papers by Ilse Bulhof, (University of Texas, Austin) on "Wilhelm Dilthey: Between History and Cultural Anthropology"; Henrika Kuklik (University of Pennsylvania) on "The Social Context of Social Science: Official Anthropology in the British Empire", and Michael Hammond (of Toronto) on "The Search for the Shadow Men: A Chapter in the History of Paleoanthropology, 1911-1946". In addition, the panel on "Changing Conceptions of Man and Human Nature at the Turn of the Century", organized by Joan Mark of the Peabody Museum, included a paper by Camille Limoges and Roger Bertrand (University of Montreal) on the recapitulation theory in French Criminal anthropology in the late 19th century. The paper by George Stocking on "Human Nature in British Anthropology" scheduled for the same panel was not, however, given, nor does it exist in circulable form.

The tenth annual history of science meeting sponsored by the Ohio Academy of Science, held on March 8, 1975, in Columbus, included a paper by Theodore W. Jeffries, of Lorain County Community College, on "The Role of John Heckewelder in American Science and Medicine."

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

CHEIRON: The International Society for the History of the Behavioral and Social Sciences, will hold its eighth annual meeting, May 28-30, 1976, at the National Museum of History and Technology, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., (down the street from the Archives of American Anthropology at the Natural History Museum). CHEIRON is especially interested in increasing its activities in the history of anthropology. Requests for further information about the program should be sent to Dr. Gisela Hinkle, Department of Sociology, Ohio State University, 1775 South College Road, Columbus, Ohio, 43210. Papers, which should be no more than twenty minutes long, are due in abstract form by November 15, 1975, and in final form by December 31, and should be sent (two copies with return postage) to Dr. Michael M. Sokal, Department of Humanities, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Massachusetts, 01609.